



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,933	12/30/2003	Sachin Doshi	884.A60US1	1886
21186	7590	01/18/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH			SCHLIE, PAUL W	
1600 TCF TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2186	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/750,933	DOSHI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Paul W. Schlie	2186	

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, details of the linked list data structure must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheets should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the drawing changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heddes et al. (5,432,908) in further in view of Appel et al. ("Unrolling Lists" LISP 6/94).

As per independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 20, Heddes et al. teaches a communication system comprising the method and/or means to enable a logical communications port to be associated with a logical FIFO threw a link to a linked-list of buffer records composed of a plurality of memory locations, themselves allocated from a linked list of such available records, each correspondingly comprising a link to a potential successive buffer record and a pointer to correspondingly queued (although potentially independently allocated) data associated with said port, such that multiple such logical FIFO's may be dynamically allocated and sized to accommodate a plurality of such ports as may be required, from an otherwise commonly accessible pool of memory (see figure 3, abstract, and column 3 lines 20-57); but does not teach explicitly that more than one pointer to queued data may compose each buffer record, thereby utilizing an unrolled linked-list in lieu of a simple linked list of records as may be desired to improve its effective utilization and/or access efficiency; however Appel et al. teaches that a linked list may be logically unrolled to accomplish this (see abstract paragraph 2, and column 2 paragraph 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the claimed invention, to combine the use of a single data-pointer linked-list to implement a variable depth FIFO as taught by Hedges et al. with the knowledge that such an implementation may be unrolled into a multiple data-pointer linked-list as taught by Appel et al, for the benefit of potentially improving the effective utilization and/or access efficiency of such a logical FIFO data structure.

As per claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19 and 21-23, being dependant on claim 1, 8, 15, 20 or correspondingly dependent claim inclusively, all limitations associated with the allocation, sizing, and/or utilization a conventional unrolled linked-list data structure as the basis of an implementation of a conventional logical FIFO (or its numerical analysis) as disclosed, are considered inherent and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the disclosed invention. Any potentially remaining claimed limitations not otherwise more explicitly addressed are considered corresponding obviously inherent in that taught, tangential to the disclosed invention, and/or not sufficient to patentably distinguish over prior art. [As an aside, as disclosed, although not seemingly claimed, Walpole et al. 2003/0236904 discloses the recognition that such an unrolled linked-list buffer record may be treated as an inherent circular list of pointers, who's logical index may be decremented until reaching the embedded link being effectively positioned at index 0 (see page 13 column 2 paragraph 0226).]

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul W. Schlie whose telephone number is 571-272-6765. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim can be reached on 517-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PIERRE BATAILLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/12/06